



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,167	10/27/2003	Jan Ryderstam	81044557 (201-0705) 3060	
28415 7	7590 07/28/2004	EXAMINER		
PRICE, HEN 695 KENMOO	EVELD, COOPER, I	HERNANDEZ, OLGA		
P. O. BOX 2567 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501-2567			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/694,167	RYDERSTAM ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	MAN			
		Olga Hernandez	3661	11000			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence a	address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a representation of the provision of t	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron ute. cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered tim n the mailing date of this ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	October 2003.					
		nis action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 8 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) 2,6,7 and 9-20 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.					
10)⊠	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 10/27/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen	• •						
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔀 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	ΓO-152)			
rape	Trojopiviali Date	6) 🔲 Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/694,167

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagami et al (5,699,248).

As per claim 1, Nakagami discloses determining a tractive force request of a driver of the vehicle; determining an actual tractive force of the vehicle; and modifying the actual tractive force of the vehicle to be equal to the tractive force request (column 8, lines 44-50).

3. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gheordunescy et al (6,151,537).

As per claim 1, Gheordunescy discloses determining a tractive force request of a driver of the vehicle; determining an actual tractive force of the vehicle; and modifying the actual tractive force of the vehicle to be equal to the tractive force request (column 5, lines 35-44).

As per claim 8, Gheordunescy teaches a request for a percentage (part of) maximum available tractive force of the vehicle (column 5, lines 40-60).

Application/Control Number: 10/694,167 Page 3

Art Unit: 3661

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gheordunescy et al (6,151,537) in view of Eckert et al (5,711,025).

As per claim 3, Gheordunescy does not teach modeling the actual tractive force. However, Eckert teaches it in figure 9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to reach a limit when a driving stability control is to take place during braking.

As per claim 4, Gheordunescy does not teach the modeling of the actual tractive force as a function of the speed. However, Eckert teaches it in column 17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to reach a limit when a driving stability control is to take place during braking.

As per claim 5, Gheordunescy teaches a request for a percentage (part of) maximum available tractive force of the vehicle (column 5, lines 40-60).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 13-20 are allowed.
- 7. Claims 2, 9-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3661

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is (703) 305-0918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (703) 305-8233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Olga Hernandez Examiner Art Unit 3661